UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,885	10/08/2003	Ram R. Rao	110466-152113	9592

31817 7590 01/26/2009

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 S.W. FIFTH AVE.
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER	
FLETCHER, JAMES A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/681,885	RAO, RAM R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES A. FLETCHER	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 October 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/14/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 14 October 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re page 9, Applicant's Representative states: "the Examiner alleged that Greenwood discloses all the elements except that Greenwood is silent regarding the simultaneous storage of both a high and low copies."

While this is true, on further inspection, Greenwood also discloses simultaneous storage of both high and low resolution copies, as shown in paragraph 0020 and cited explicitly below. Therefore, any need for a second teaching of simultaneous storage is unnecessary.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim recites in the first limitation, "by the computing device." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this wording. Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claims 14 and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities. The claims both recite “is performed at based at least in part…” The Examiner believes the claims should read –is performed based at least in part—and will analyze and discuss the claims as though they were written as such. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-11 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Greenwood (US PG Publication 20030198458).

Regarding claim 1, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program comprising:

- storing, by a computing device (Paragraph 0014 "a processor 130 such as a microprocessor or other electronic circuitry capable of being programmed or executing program instructions stored on a memory"), the entire received program as a first digital copy having a first quality level (Paragraph 0018 “new content in the form of a video program is received by the system”);
- converting, by the computing device, the first digital copy into a second digital copy of the entire received program having a second quality level of lesser quality than the first quality level (Paragraph 0017 “A storage management

system 200 in FIG. 2 selectively reduces a quality level of previously stored content to free storage space for new content");

- storing, by the computing device, the second digital copy (paragraph 0019 "Once it is determined that additional storage space is required for a currently identified or, optionally, yet to be identified video, and a video for quality reduction is identified, a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video and restore it to storage") along with the first digital copy (Paragraph 0020 "a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video and restore it to storage. The higher quality copy of the video is then deleted from storage); and
- applying, by the computing device, a retention policy which requires at least deletion of selected ones of the stored first and second digital copies (Paragraph 0020 "a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video and restore it to storage. The higher quality copy of the video is then deleted from storage").

To further explain, Greenwood, by disclosing storage of a converted quality video, followed in time by the deletion of the higher quality video explicitly discloses simultaneous storage of the entire program in both high and low quality copies.

Regarding claim 2, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program comprising:

- receiving, by the computing device, a request to schedule a recording of the program (Paragraph 0002 "Recording systems for recording content, such as

video programs received in the home are becoming more prevalent. Such systems allow a user in the home to select programs to record for later playback.");

- determining, by the computing device, a recording quality and a longevity for the program (Paragraph 0018 "A determining module 215 monitors storage levels in a storage 220 to determine if there is sufficient storage space for the video program. In some embodiments, the video program indicates how much storage space it requires."); and
- associating, by the computing device, the recording quality and longevity with the program (Paragraph 0019 "If the determining module determines that there is insufficient storage space available, an identifier module is used to determine which videos qualify for quality reduction. This is based on the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video"); wherein
- applying the retention policy is performed based at least in part on the associated desired longevity (Paragraph 0019 "If the determining module determines that there is insufficient storage space available, an identifier module is used to determine which videos qualify for quality reduction. This is based on the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video").

Regarding claim 3, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program wherein the recording quality comprises high, medium and low quality (Paragraph 0022 "In one embodiment, three levels of content or video program quality levels are provided; low, medium and high").

Regarding claim 4, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program wherein determining the quality and longevity comprises a selected one of:

- utilizing a default quality and longevity or prompting for the desired quality and longevity (Paragraph 0019 "If the determining module determines that there is insufficient storage space available, an identifier module is used to determine which videos qualify for quality reduction. This is based on the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video").

Regarding claim 5, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program wherein longevity comprises long, medium, and temporary, and wherein applying the retention policy further comprises comparing associated quality settings and longevity to determine which stored copy of a program is to be deleted (Paragraph 0019 "Users may specify one of various rating systems to indicate the importance of keeping each video, such as a scale of 1, 2 or 3, with 1 being videos that are never converted to lower quality, and 3 being the videos that are first converted to lower quality as needed").

Regarding claim 6, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program comprising:

- receiving, by the computing device, a request to schedule a recording of the program, the request having an associated quality to utilize for recording the program (Paragraph 0002 “Recording systems for recording content, such as video programs received in the home are becoming more prevalent. Such systems allow a user in the home to select programs to record for later playback”);
- inferring, by the computing device, a longevity for the recording based on the associated quality (Paragraph 0017 “When storage in the system is becoming full, selected content is converted to a lower quality based at least one of priority or age”);
- periodically, during the inferred longevity, selecting, by the computing device, a stored copy of the program and determining a lesser quality for the stored copy based at least in part on how long of the inferred longevity the stored copy has been stored (Paragraph 0023 “If the space available is less than a threshold, T, a next low priority video program is identified, along with a desired compression or quality level. T is derived from the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video”); and
- degrading, by the computing device, the stored copy of the program in accordance with the lesser quality (Paragraph 0034 “the next low priority

video is converted to lower quality, normally corresponding to a higher compression rate and therefore less storage").

Regarding claim 7, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program comprising determining, by the computing device, a bitrate and an encoding format for the first and second digital copies, wherein the first and second quality levels are determined based at least in part on the bitrate and the encoding format utilized (Paragraph 0022 "The low level requires the least amount of storage, while the high quality level provides the highest quality and also requires the most amount of storage, as it is compressed the least. One such compression scheme is well known and set forth in MPEG/2 standards for video compression. Further compression schemes will also operate with the present invention").

Regarding claim 8, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program wherein the first and second quality levels are determined based at least in part on a bitrate utilized to encode the first and second digital copies (Paragraph 0022 "In one embodiment, three levels of content or video program quality levels are provided; low, medium and high. The low level requires the least amount of storage, while the high quality level provides the highest quality and also requires the most amount of storage, as it is compressed the least").

Regarding claim 9, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program wherein the first and second quality levels are determined based at least in part on an encoding format utilized to encode the first and second digital copies

(Paragraph 0020 “Different known conversion routines may require varying amounts of available storage to perform a conversion”).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program comprising:

- converting, by the computing device, the first and second digital format into a third digital format having a third quality level of lesser quality than the second quality level (Paragraph 0023 “If the space available is less than a threshold, T, a next low priority video program is identified, along with a desired compression or quality level” and Paragraph 0022 “In one embodiment, three levels of content or video program quality levels are provided; low, medium and high”); and
- storing, by the computing device, the third digital format (Paragraph 0024 “the next low priority video is converted to lower quality, normally corresponding to a higher compression rate and therefore less storage”);
- deleting, by the computing device, selected ones of the stored first, second, and third digital formats in accordance with the retention policy (Paragraph 0019 “Users may specify one of various rating systems to indicate the importance of keeping each video, such as a scale of 1, 2 or 3, with 1 being videos that are never converted to lower quality, and 3 being the videos that are first converted to lower quality as needed.” and Paragraph 0023 “If the space available is less than a threshold, T, a next low priority video program is identified, along with a desired compression or quality level. T is derived

from the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video").

Regarding claim 19, Greenwood discloses a personal video recorder (PVR), comprising:

- a video encoder configured to encode an input signal corresponding to a program into a higher quality copy of the entire program for storage in a storage (Paragraph 0018 "210, new content in the form of a video program is received by the system" and Paragraph 0022 "three levels of content or video program quality levels are provided; low, medium and high");
- a transcoder configured to convert in the storage the higher quality copy of the program into at least one copy of the entire program with lesser quality for storage along with the higher quality copy of the program (Paragraph 0017 "When storage in the system is becoming full, selected content is converted to a lower quality based at least one of priority or age" and Paragraph 0020 "a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video and restore it to storage."); and
- a storage manager configured to inspect the polices within a policy store associated with the storage manager and to apply selected ones of the policies to copies of the program so as to manage consumption of the storage (Paragraph 0019 "If the determining module determines that there is

insufficient storage space available, an identifier module is used to determine which videos qualify for quality reduction").

Regarding claim 20, Greenwood discloses a PVR, wherein the transcoder stores the higher and at least one lesser quality copies of the program as components of a scalable bitstream (Paragraph 0024 "the next low priority video is converted to lower quality, normally corresponding to a higher compression rate and therefore less storage. Such conversion is performed in a computing background to minimize interference with programs being currently viewed. In further embodiments, conversion is performed when the system is not in use, or upon initiation of the user. In yet further embodiments, a user directly identifies programs to be converted, and the level of quality desired").

Regarding claim 21, Greenwood discloses a PVR, wherein applying a selected one of the policies by the storage manager includes the storage manager deleting the higher quality copy of the program from the storage (Paragraph 0020 "a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video and restore it to storage. The higher quality copy of the video is then deleted from storage").

Regarding claim 22, Greenwood discloses a PVR comprising:

- a video decoder configured to be used in conjunction with retrieving a best available copy of the program from the storage (Paragraph 0022 "three levels of content of video program quality levels are provided; low, medium and high" and Paragraph 0028 "Multiple columns of information are provided to the user, such as content column 415, priority column 420 and current and

new quality level columns, 425 and 430 respectively. These columns provide users with the ability to select a video by use of a check box, or other common user interface construct, and to specify both a priority and a quality level for conversion"), configured to convert the best available copy of the program into an output format suitable for presentation to a display (Paragraph 0020 "The decoder is also used to decode programs in storage 220, or programs received, to permit a display-I/O controller 240 to display the video programs on display 250.").

Regarding claim 23, Greenwood discloses an article of manufacture comprising:

- a storage medium for digitally storing a received program (Paragraph 0015 "Video programs are stored on a storage device 150"); and
- a plurality of programming instructions designed to program an apparatus and enable the apparatus to store in a storage the entire received program as a first digital copy having a first quality level (Paragraph 0018 "new content in the form of a video program is received by the system");
- convert the first digital format into a second digital copy of the entire received program having a second quality level of lesser quality than the first quality level (Paragraph 0017 "A storage management system 200 in FIG. 2 selectively reduces a quality level of previously stored content to free storage space for new content");
- temporarily store the second digital copy in the storage (paragraph 0019 "Once it is determined that additional storage space is required for a currently

identified or, optionally, yet to be identified video, and a video for quality reduction is identified, a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video and restore it to storage"); and

- apply a retention policy which requires at least deletion of selected ones of the stored first and second digital copies (Paragraph 0020 "a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video and restore it to storage. The higher quality copy of the video is then deleted from storage").

Regarding claim 24, Greenwood discloses an article of manufacture wherein the programming instructions are further designed to:

- receive a request to schedule a recording of the program (Paragraph 0002 "Recording systems for recording content, such as video programs received in the home are becoming more prevalent. Such systems allow a user in the home to select programs to record for later playback");
- determine a desired recording quality and a longevity for the program (Paragraph 0023 "If the space available is less than a threshold, T, a next low priority video program is identified, along with a desired compression or quality level. T is derived from the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video"); and
- associate the quality and longevity with the program, wherein the data, which when executed applies the retention policy, further includes data for applying the retention policy based at least in part on the associated desired longevity

(Paragraph 0019 "If the determining module determines that there is insufficient storage space available, an identifier module is used to determine which videos qualify for quality reduction. This is based on the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video").

Regarding claim 25, Greenwood discloses an article wherein the programming instructions are further designed to:

- determine a first bitrate for encoding the first digital copy (Paragraph 0022 "The low level requires the least amount of storage, while the high quality level provides the highest quality and also requires the most amount of storage, as it is compressed the least. One such compression scheme is well known and set forth in MPEG/2 standards for video compression. Further compression schemes will also operate with the present invention"); and
- determining a second bitrate for encoding the second digital copy (Paragraph 0024 "the next low priority video is converted to lower quality, normally corresponding to a higher compression rate and therefore less storage");
- wherein the first and second quality levels are respectively determined based at least in part on the first and second bitrates (Fig 4 shows a Quality setting for the various digital copies in the storage. Paragraph 0022 discloses that quality is dependent on the amount of storage, which is itself dependent on the bitrate of the recording file).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 12-18 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwood.

Regarding claim 12, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program, comprising:

- receiving, by a computing device, a first program (Paragraph 0018 “new content in for form of a video program is received by the system”);
- first converting, by the computing device, the entire first program into a first higher quality copy (Paragraph 0015 “Video programs are stored on a storage device”) and a first lower quality copy (Paragraph 0020 "a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video), and storing the first higher copy along with the first lower quality copy in a storage (Paragraph 0020 “and restore it to storage”);
- determining, by the computing device, there is insufficient space in the storage for storing a second higher quality copy for a second program (Paragraph 0018 "A determining module 215 monitors storage levels in a storage 220 to determine if there is sufficient storage space for the video program" and Paragraph 0022 “three levels of content of video program quality levels are provided; low, medium and high. The low level requires the

least amount of storage, while the high quality level provides the highest quality and also requires the most amount of storage, as it is compressed the least"); and

- deleting, by the computing device, at least one of the first higher quality copy and the first lower quality copy to make room within the storage for storing the second higher quality copy (Paragraph 0020 "The higher quality copy of the video is then deleted from storage").

Regarding claim 26, Greenwood discloses an article of manufacture comprising

- a storage medium for digitally storing a received program (Paragraph 0015 "Video programs are stored on a storage device 150. Storage device 150 comprises one or more devices utilizing tape, m"gnetic disk, optical disk, semiconductor storage, or other type of storage having a large enough capacity and high enough retrieval rate for providing video programs to be displayed") and
    - a plurality of programming instructions designed to program an apparatus (Paragraph 0027 "The functions described herein are implemented in software in one embodiment, where the software comprises computer executable instructions").

Further regarding claim 26, please refer to Examiner's remarks regarding claim 12.

Further regarding claim 12, Although Greenwood does not explicitly disclose performing the previously disclosed converting and deletion steps on additional

programs, the Examiner notes that Greenwood does disclose multiple programs being stored on the medium, and multiple compression steps of those programs, as noted in Paragraph 0025-0028, at least.

Conversion and deletion of large recordings in order to make room for additional recording provides the user with the ability to decide between the quality of the existing recordings and the ability to add new recordings to the medium is old and well-known in the art and; therefore, Official Notice is take.. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Greenwood by incorporating the well-known conversion and deletion in order to extend the already disclosed actions of conversion and deletion of programs to additional programs.

Regarding claim 13, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program wherein stored copies of the first program each have an associated retention policy (Paragraph 0019 "If the determining module determines that there is insufficient storage space available, an identifier module is used to determine which videos qualify for quality reduction. This is based on the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video"), and wherein the deleting of the at least one of the first higher quality copy and the first lower quality copy is performed based at least in part on said associated retention policies (Paragraph 0020 “The higher quality copy of the video is then deleted from storage”).

Regarding claims 14 and 15, Greenwood discloses a method for digitally storing a received program wherein the deleting of the at least one of the first higher

quality copy and the first lower quality copy is performed at based at least in part on storage requirements for the second higher quality copy of the second program (Paragraph 0028 "Multiple columns of information are provided to the user, such as a content column 415, priority column 420 and current and new quality level columns, 425 and 430 respectively. These columns provide users with the ability to select a video by use of a check box, or other common user interface construct, and to specify both a priority and a quality level for conversion" and Paragraph 0020 "Once it is determined that additional storage space is required for a currently identified or, optionally, yet to be identified video, and sic a video for quality reduction is identified, a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video and restore it to storage. The higher quality copy of the video is then deleted from storage").

Regarding claims 16 and 27, Greenwood discloses a method and article of manufacture comprising programming instructions for digitally storing a received program comprising:

- receiving, by the computing device, the second program (Paragraph 0018 "new content in the form of a video program is received by the system");
- second converting, by the computing device, the second program into the second higher quality copy and a second lower quality copy (Paragraph 0020 "a decoder 230 and encoder 235 are used to convert the quality of the video); and
- storing, by the computing device, the second higher and lower quality copies in the storage (Col 6, lines 47-49 "the transcoded data is transferred, e.g.,

through a disk or tape interface, to a storage device to be stored for later playback by the user").

Regarding claim 17, Greenwood discloses a method comprising determining, by the computing device, a first quality level associated with the first program, wherein converting the first program into the first higher quality copy comprises encoding the first program with a storage quantity determined based at least in part on the first quality level (paragraph 0022 "three levels of content or video program quality levels are provided; low, medium and high. The low level requires the least amount of storage, while the high quality level provides the highest quality and also requires the most amount of storage, as it is compressed the least").

Greenwood does not explicitly disclose a bit rate as a parameter of quality, but does disclose an inverse relationship between quality and amount of storage, as discussed above.

The Examiner takes official notice that bit rate and storage amounts for real-time reproduced data such as video programs are generally equivalent and are notoriously known as such.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Greenwood in order to include a bit rate parameter in the compression level decision.

Regarding claims 18 and 28, Greenwood discloses a method and article of manufacture comprising programming instructions for digitally storing a received program comprising:

- applying, by the computing device, selected ones of global policies to all stored copies (Paragraph 0023 “Available storage is monitored at 310. If the space available is less than a threshold, T, a next low priority video program is identified, along with a desired compression or quality level. T is derived from the length of time a video has been stored, frequency of viewing of the video, when it was last viewed, or based on a user defined priority for the video”), and
- altering, by the computing device, the stored programs in accord with a selected global policy (Paragraph 0024 "the next low priority video is converted to lower quality, normally corresponding to a higher compression rate and therefore less storage” and Paragraph 0028 " Multiple columns of information are provided to the user, such as a content column 415, priority column 420 and current and new quality level columns, 425 and 430 respectively. These columns provide users with the ability to select a video by use of a check box, or other common user interface construct, and to specify both a priority and a quality level for conversion ").

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES A. FLETCHER whose telephone number is (571)272-7377. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:45-5:45 M-Th, first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAF
17 January 2008

/Thai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621